

**REMARKS/ARGUMENT**

Claims 1-11 are pending in this application. Claims 1-11 stand rejected. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 6 have been amended. The amendments made to the claims do not alter the scope of these claims, nor have these amendments been made to define over the prior art. Rather, the amendments to the claims have been made to improve the form thereof. In light of the amendments and remarks set forth below, Applicant respectfully submits that each of the pending claims is in immediate condition for allowance.

Paragraph 1 of the Office Action rejects the title as not descriptive. Applicant has amended the title to read “MOBILE TELEPHONE HAVING A REDIAL FUNCTION RELATING MULTIPLE REDIAL NUMBERS TO A SELECTED REDIAL NUMBER AND REDIAL METHOD THEREFOR”. Applicant therefore requests withdrawal of this rejection.

Paragraph 3 of the Office Action rejects claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,064,725 (“Nakanishi”). Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

To anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the cited reference must disclose every element of the claim, as arranged in the claim, and in sufficient detail to enable one skilled in the art to make and use the anticipated subject matter. See, PPG Industries, Inc. v. Guardian Industries Corp., 75 F.3d 1558, 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1996); C.R. Bard, Inc. v. M3

Sys., Inc., 157 F.3d 1340, 1349 (Fed. Cir. 1998). A reference that does not expressly disclose all of the elements of a claimed invention cannot anticipate unless all of the undisclosed elements are inherently present in the reference. See, Continental Can Co. USA v. Monsanto Co., 942 F.2d 1264, 1268 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Among the limitations of independent claim 1 not present in the cited reference is a controller for controlling such that a registered phone number related to a selected redial phone number is displayed on the display device to be redialed.

In the present invention, a mobile telephone with a redial function is claimed such that a plurality of registered phone numbers related to a plurality of registered names are retrievably stored in a first memory. A second memory then stores a plurality of redial phone numbers which have been dialed. A controller relates the registered phone numbers with the redial phone numbers such that the mobile telephone will redial a registered phone number related to a registered name as well as redial numbers which have been related to the registered name or registered phone number. In other words, multiple telephone numbers can be associated with a redial number such that if a party does not answer a first-dialed number, other related numbers will be dialed until the party is reached.

In contrast, Nakanishi discloses a telephone having a call history log as well as a directory. In Nakanishi, the call history is collated with the stored directory so that calls in the call history that are not stored in the telephone directory can be displayed. See, column

7, lines 17-25. Further, in Nakanishi, multiple occurrences of a single phone number will not be stored. Only the most recent occurrence of a call will be stored as shown in Figures 7A and B. Thus, Nakanishi does not disclose relating redial numbers to a registered phone number as explicitly recited in Applicant's claim.

Claims 2-5 and 9-11 depend from, and contain all the limitations of claim 1. These dependent claims also recite additional limitations which, in combination with the limitations of claim 1, are neither disclosed nor suggested by Nakanishi and are also believed to be directed towards the patentable subject matter. Thus, claims 2-5 and 9-11 should also be allowed.

Among the limitations of independent claim 6 not taught or recited in the Nakanishi reference is retrieving a plurality of registered phone numbers related to said selected redial phone number.

As discussed above, in Nakanishi, the registered phone numbers are not related to a redial number. In Nakanishi, the stored call history merely stores the latest iteration or occurrence of a call and verifies that calls are present in the telephone directory.

In contrast, in the present application, a registered phone number is related to a name which is also related to redial telephone numbers such that when a telephone call is placed to a registered name, the registered number will be called as well as other redial numbers related to the registered phone number. Thus, Nakanishi fails to disclose the

explicitly recited limitation of retrieving a plurality of registered phone numbers related to said selected redial phone number. Thus, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) has been overcome and claim 6 should be allowed.

Claims 7-8 depend from, and contain all the limitations of claim 6. These dependent claims also recite additional limitations which, in combination with the limitations of claim 6, are neither disclosed nor suggested by Nakanishi and are also believed to be directed towards the patentable subject matter. Thus, claims 7-8 should also be allowed.

Therefore, it is asserted that the rejection of claims 1-11, under 35 U.S.C. § 102 has been overcome. Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-11, under 35 U.S.C. § 102 is respectfully requested in light of the amendments and remarks above.

Applicant has responded to all of the rejections and objections recited in the Office Action. Reconsideration and a Notice of Allowance for all of the pending claims are therefore respectfully requested.

The amendments to the claims are for clarification purposes only and are not intended to limit the scope of the claims in any way. It is asserted that the present amendment places the application in a form for allowance. Entry of this amendment is therefore earnestly solicited.

Application No.: 09/406,671

Docket No.: K2291.0076/P076

If the Examiner believes an interview would be of assistance, the Examiner is welcome to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

Dated: August 13, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Ian R. Blum

Registration No.: 42,336

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &  
OSHINSKY LLP

1177 Avenue of the Americas - 41st Floor

New York, New York 10036-2714

(212) 835-1400

Attorney for Applicant

IRB/mgs